

Serial No. 10/043,140
February 27, 2004
Reply to the Office Action dated December 8, 2003
Page 9 of 11

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claim 1.

Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's indication that claim 20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ushiroku et al. (U.S. 6,137,380). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended recite:

"A ladder circuit type surface acoustic wave filter device comprising:
a piezoelectric substrate;
a plurality of parallel arm resonators and a plurality of series arm resonators provided on said piezoelectric substrate, the parallel arm resonators and the series arm resonators being defined by surface acoustic wave resonators; and

a plurality of inductors respectively connected in series to said plurality of parallel arm resonators; wherein
the parallel arm resonators include a first parallel arm resonator of said plurality of parallel arm resonators connected to one of an input end and an output end of the filter device, and a second parallel arm resonator of said plurality of parallel arm resonators connected to a junction between two series arm resonators of said plurality of series arm resonators; and
said first parallel arm resonator and said second parallel arm resonator have a relationship represented by the following expression:

$$Cp1 \times 2 < Cp2$$

where Cp1 represents the capacitance of said first parallel arm resonator, and Cp2 represents the capacitance of said second parallel arm resonator; and

a total equivalent inductance of all of the inductors of said plurality of inductors that are connected to said second parallel arm resonator is substantially equal to or less than a total equivalent inductance of all of the inductors of said plurality of inductors connected to said first parallel arm resonator." (emphasis added)

With the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in the present claimed invention, including "a total equivalent inductance of all of the inductors of said

Serial No. 10/043,140
February 27, 2004
Reply to the Office Action dated December 8, 2003
Page 10 of 11

plurality of inductors that are connected to said second parallel arm resonator is substantially equal to or less than a total equivalent inductance of all of the inductors of said plurality of inductors connected to said first parallel arm resonator," Applicant has produced an improved ladder circuit type SAW filter device which has sufficient attenuation in each stop band of ranges higher and lower than a pass band and superior steepness of filter characteristics in a low frequency domain in the vicinity of the pass band (see, for example, the second full paragraph on page 4 of the present application, as originally filed).

The Examiner alleged that Ushiroku et al. teaches all of the features recited in the present claimed invention including "the inductor of said plurality of inductors that is connected to said second parallel arm resonator has an inductance that is substantially equal to or less than the inductance of the inductor of said plurality of inductors connected to said first parallel arm resonator".

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite "a total equivalent inductance of all of the inductors of said plurality of inductors that are connected to said second parallel arm resonator is substantially equal to or less than a total equivalent inductance of all of the inductors of said plurality of inductors connected to said first parallel arm resonator."

As acknowledged by the Examiner in the paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4 of the outstanding Office Action, Ushiroku et al. fails to teach or suggest that a total equivalent inductance of all of bonding wires (inductors) connected to a first parallel arm resonator is equal to or less than a total equivalent inductance of all of the bonding wires (inductors) connected to a second parallel arm resonator. Thus, Ushiroku et al. clearly fails to teach or suggest each and every element recited in Applicant's claim 1, including "a total equivalent inductance of all of the inductors of said plurality of inductors that are connected to said second parallel arm resonator is substantially equal to or less than a total equivalent inductance of all of the inductors of said plurality of inductors connected to said first parallel arm resonator."

Serial No. 10/043,140
February 27, 2004
Reply to the Office Action dated December 8, 2003
Page 11 of 11

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Ushiroku et al. fails to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in claim 1 of the present application.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-20 depend upon claim 1, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 27, 2004


Attorneys for Applicant

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710

KEATING & BENNETT LLP
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312
Fairfax, VA 22030
Telephone: (703) 385-5200
Facsimile: (703) 385-5080